DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 133 UD 016 520

AUTHOR Penner, Louise A.; Anh, Tran
TITLE A Comparison of American and Vietnamese Value Systems.
NOTE 37p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Culture; Beliefs; *Comparative Analysis; *Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Context; Cultural Differences; Cultural Factors; Educational Background; Educational Experience; Ethnic Groups; Group Norms; *Moral Values; *Personal Values; Sex Differences; *Social Values
IDENTIFIERS *United States; *Vietnam

ABSTRACT

The similarities and differences in value systems between Americans and Vietnamese are investigated in this study. A national sample of 1,427 Americans was given Rockeach's (1969) value survey. The scale was then translated into Vietnamese and given to a randomly selected group of 349 Vietnamese living in South Vietnam shortly before the fall of Saigon. Three comparisons of value systems were made: (1) overall differences between Americans and Vietnamese; (2) differences between males and females in the two countries; and (3) differences between individuals with comparable amounts of education in the two countries. Among the results reported are: (1) Vietnamese are more concerned about their security and less concerned about their individual freedom than are Americans; (2) the value systems of males in the two countries tend to be more similar than the value systems of women; (3) college educated Vietnamese respondents are more like their American counterparts than are less educated Vietnamese; and (4) in many respects, the values of college educated Vietnamese are more similar to Americans' values than to those of other Vietnamese. Two conclusions are made: What primarily differentiates the respondents in the two countries is not their goals in life, but the means by which these are reached. (2) These value differences seem to be due to the Confucian influence in Vietnam and may be less modifiable by experiential factors than terminal values. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131133

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COMPARISON OF AMERICAN AND VIETNAMESE VALUE SYSTEMS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Louis A. Penner

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Louis A. Penner and Tran Anh

Department of Psychology

University of South Florida

Tampa, Florida 33620

In Press Journal of Social Psychology

UD 016520

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the similarities and differences in value systems between Americans and Vietnamese. A national sample of 1427 Americans was given Rokeach's value survey (19). The scale was then translated into Vietnamese and given to a randomly selected group of 349 Vietnamese living in South Vietnam shortly before the fall of the Saigon government.

Three comparisons of value systems were conducted via stepwise discriminant analyses: (a) overall differences between Americans and Vietnamese, (b) differences between males and females in the two countries, and (c) differences between individuals with comparable amounts of education in the two countries. In terms of overall differences, Vietnamese were more concerned about their security and less concerned about their individual freedom than were Americans. This difference was even more pronounced when Vietnamese women were compared with American women. Finally, it was found that the college-educated Vietnamese respondents were more like their American counterparts than were less educated Vietnamese. Further, in many respects, the values of college-educated Vietnamese were more similar to Americans' values than to other Vietnamese. The implications of these findings in terms of cross-cultural value differences and the impact of the American presence in Vietnam were discussed.

A Comparison of American and Vietnamese Value Systems[1]

Louis A. Penner and "Tran-Anh"[2]
University of South Florida

A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to conduct a cross-cultural comparison of the value systems of Americans and South Vietnamese. Values were chosen for investigation because rather than being concerned with reactions to specific objects and situations as attitudes are, values are concerned with a person's world view or "ethos" (5). Thus value differences (and similarities) would seem to present the most appropriate means for comparing two cultures.

Values, according to Rokeach (21), are single beliefs centrally located within a person's total belief system. In Rokeach's conceptualization, values are organized into two separate yet related systems: terminal values (beliefs about an end state of existence) and instrumental values (beliefs about a mode of conduct). These values are organized, within each system, along a continuum of importance. Rokeach (19, 21) has proposed that the relative importance of the two value systems can be measured by having respondents rank order their terminal and then insturmental values in order of importance to themselves. Although Rokeach's mode of measurement of values is somewhat unique, his conceptualization of values is quite similar to those of other value theorists (e.g., 1, 14, 15).

Rokeach's orientation to values and their measurement was chosen over other approaches (e.g., 1, 15) for two reasons. First, the

instrument he has developed to measure values (19) has been shown to: (a) be easy to administer to individuals with limited education (3, 21, 22) (b) have an acceptable test-retest reliability (6); and (c) have been used successfully in previous cross-cultural studies (7, 18).

Second, there is a good deal of empirical support for Rokeach's contention that values, as he measures them, are important determinants of the attitudes people hold and the behavior they engage in. With regard to the caural relationship between values and attitudes, Rokeach (21) and Hopkins (12) have shown that systematically induced changes in values yield long term attitude changes that are consistent with the changed values. Conroy, Katkin, and Barnette (4), Penner (17), and Rokeach (20, 21) have all demonstrated long term behavioral changes as the result of the systematic inducement of changes in the importance of selected values.

In order to understand the rationale behind the hypotheses that follow, it is necessary to discuss some of the characteristics of South Vietnam at the time the study was conducted. First, of course, there was the civil war that began in the 1940's and continued until shortly after this study was completed. Second, South Vietnam was an agrarian society. Approximately 60% of the residents lived in rural areas, and 65% of the population listed their occupation as farmer (2). Finally, the predominant influence on Vietnamese culture came from Confucianism (8, 10). Confucianism is not so much a religion as a set of guidelines as to how a person's life should be conducted. The main aspects of Confucianism deal with how a "quan tu," a man of virtue, should live. This person should display the following virtues: generosity, moderation,

politeness, reason, steadfastness, and trust. Individual achievement is de-emphasized, and the person's primary responsibility is to the family and the society. In addition, Confucianism stresses filial piety and the subservience of women to, first, their fathers, and later in life, their husbands. Despite the fact that Western colonial powers (France and the United States) had occupied Vietnam on and off for the last one hundred years and the major religion in Vietnam was Buddhism (80% of the people), most scholars agree that the Confucian ideology has remained the predominant one in Vietnam (8, 10). Among the countries of Southeast Asia, Vietnam was unique in terms of the dominance of a Confucian ideology (8).

Little, if any, data are available on the specific attitudes of the Vietnamese. Although there has been at least one previous public opinion survey in Vietnam (conducted in 1967), White (23) pointed out that the use of questions specifically concerned with the "Viet Cong" may have produced a "very great lack of frankness" (p. 100). In this regard it should be noted that since the value survey does not directly ask about political ideologies, it is presumably a less reactive instrument than an attitude scale.

Three comparisons between Americans and Vietnamese will be reported here. These are (a) differences in value systems between the entire American and Vietnamese samples, (b) differences between Vietnamese and Americans of the same sex, and (c) differences between Vietnamese and Americans with comparable amounts of education.

With regard to similarities and differences between the value systems of American and Vietnamese, it was hypothesized that the differences

between the two groups' instrumental values would be much greater than the differences in their terminal values. This prediction was based on the premise that what differentiates cultures is not so much their goals in life (terminal values) but rather the means by which they attain these goals (instrumental values). This should be especially applicable in a comparison between a Confucian and a non-Confucian culture. Confucian ideology, as has already been noted, deals with a mode of conduct rather than an end state of existence.

Two hypotheses were made about differences in specific values. First, it was predicted that the Confucian tradition, in combination with the autocratic form of government Vietnam has had for at least a thousand years, would result in Vietnamese being less concerned about Freedom (a terminal value) and more concerned about being Obedient (an instrumental value) than would Americans. Also, it was thought that the war fought in Vietnam for at least 30 years would result in the Vietnamese considering values concerned with security (e.g., National Security) and peace (e.g., A World at Peace) as more important than would Americans.

It was predicted that the value systems of women in the two countries would differ more than the value systems of men. This prediction was based on the role assigned women in a Confucian culture. Although women in the United States have been deprived of some of their civil rights by both law and tradition, the relative status of women in America is probably much higher than it is for Vietnamese women. The difference in status, plus the cultural differences between the countries, should yield

greater differences between women in the two countries than between men. With regard to specific values, Vietnamese women should differ most dramatically from the American women on values concerned with equal rights and the role of women in the society (e.g., Ambitious, Equality, Obedient).

Finally, with regard to education, it was predicted that Americans and Vietnamese with a college education would possess much more similar value systems than would Americans and Vietnamese with an elementary school education. This prediction was based on the fact that as an individual progressed through the Vietnamese educational system, he (or she) would be increasingly exposed to Western thought and values. This Western influence should be manifested in the importance assigned terminal values such as Freedom and Equality by the college-educated Vietnamese. Whereas less educated Vietnamese should differ from their American counterparts on the rankings of these values, college-educated Vietnamese should not.

B. METHOD

1. Subjects

a. American Sample. The American respondents were 1,428 adults interviewed in a national survey conducted for Milton Rokeach by the National Opinion Research Center in 1971.[3] An area probability sampling technique was used.

b. Vietnamese Sample. The Vietnamese respondents were 349 individuals 17 years of age and over, interviewed between November 1, 1974, and January 15, 1975. All respondents resided in a province

250 miles northeast of Saigon. This province contained 200,000 residents, 40% of whom lived in a large city, and 60% of whom lived in small villages.

This province was chosen for three reasons. First and foremost, the second author had contacts with a large number of university students in the province, and this provided trained, unpaid volunteers. Second, the province chosen contained a fairly representative cross-section of Vietnamese. The representativeness of the population of the province was due to the fact that until 1945 the province was considered the property of the royal family in Vietnam, and was sparsely populated. Following the deposing of the king, the extremely fertile soil and excellent climate in the area attracted large numbers of persons from all over Vietnam. Finally, in contrast to other provinces in Vietnam, this province was, until the days immediately preceding the fall of the Saigon government, free of major attacks by the National Liberation Front, or North Vietnamese. Thus, an interviewer would be able to travel to the rural areas in relative safety, and all geographic locations in the province could be sampled.

2. Sampling Technique

A quota sampling technique was used. The demographic characteristics upon which the quotas were set were gender, occupation (farmer, civil servant, other), religion (Buddhist, Catholic, other), and place of residence (rural, urban). The quota percentages were the following: (a) gender--50% male, 50% female, (b) occupation--36.5% farmer, 36.5% civil servant, 27.0% other, (c) religion--45.0% Buddhist, 27% Catholic,

27% other, and (d) place of residence--60% rural, 40% urban. The rationale behind the setting of quota percentages was not that they match the population percentages on these characteristics. Rather, the goal was to insure that the various subgroups would have sufficient representation to allow statistical analyses of them. Although the authors desired to obtain 550 interviews, the quota percentages were based on the assumption that only 275 interviews might be conducted. Within the rural area, two villages in each province district were selected by chance. Since all areas of the province were secure at the time of the study, all districts were included in the pool from which the villages were drawn. Within the large city, two of the 10 precincts were selected by chance.

3. Procedure

Thirty university students served as interviewers. As part of their academic training, all interviewers had had previous field experience in conducting interviews. Interviewers were supervised by an individual with a graduate degree in sociology who "spot checked" the interviewers. Each interviewer was given a quota to fill and a geographic location in which to fill it. Once in a geographic location, an interviewer was to employ the following procedure: A house from a row of houses was to be selected by chance and the first person in that household to fit the characteristics prescribed by the interviewer's quota was given the interview. Thereafter, every third house in the row was to be approached and the same procedure followed until the interviewer's quota was filled. In order to minimize reactivity

effects, the interviewers left the household while the value survey was filled out.

4. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. In the first part, respondents gave their age, sex, marital status, number of times moved in the last year, religion, occupation, years of education, income, ethnic origin (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodian, Chinese) and other similar types of information. Names were not asked for.

The second part of the questionnaire was a Vietnamese translation of Form E of Rokeach's Value Survey (19). In Form E, respondents are presented with alphabetized lists of 18 terminal values (along with defining phrases) and then 18 instrumental values (along with defining phrases). Respondents rank order the terminal and then the instrumental values in order of importance to themselves. The five-week test-retest reliability for terminal values is +.74 and +.70 for the instrumental values (6). In the Vietnamese version of the value survey, the values were presented in the order they appeared in the Vietnamese alphabet.

In order to arrive at a suitable Vietnamese translation of Rokeach's Value Survey, the following procedure was used: Two bilingual Vietnamese nationals independently translated the survey into Vietnamese. They then met with the second author and resolved any inconsistencies in translation. The scale in Vietnamese was given to two other Vietnamese nationals who independently translated it back into English. These English translations were compared by an American student to Rokeach's original scale. The only departure from Rokeach's original scale was that the word "Nirvana" was presented along with Salvation in the Vietnamese version. Although

the Buddhist concept of Nirvana and the Christian concept of Salvation are not, strictly speaking, equivalent, it was felt that the large number of Buddhist respondents necessitated its inclusion.

C. RESULTS

1. Response Rate

Five hundred ten interviews were attempted; 349 usable questionnaires (68.4%) were obtained. Approximately 13% of the people contacted refused to fill out the questionnaire. Another 19% of the potential respondents were functionally illiterate and/or filled out the value survey incorrectly.

The percentages obtained matched the desired percentages quite well; no obtained percentage deviated from the desired percentage by more than 5.6%. At the same time it must be noted that the respondents in the Vietnamese sample were probably of a higher socio-economic level and were more in sympathy with the Saigon government than the general Vietnamese population at the time the survey was conducted. This was due, first, to the selection bias created by certain types of persons not filling out the questionnaire and, second, the deliberate over-representation of certain subgroups in the sample (e.g., civil servants comprised 25% of the Vietnamese population, but 33% of the sample).

2. Mode of Analyses

The cross-cultural comparisons were conducted with the use of two types of statistics. In order to determine overall differences in the relative importance of the values, a rank order correlation (11) was computed between the ordering of means for the Americans' value systems and the Vietnamese' value systems. In order to determine

univariate and multivariate differences between the cultures, stepwise discriminant analyses (13) were used. The S.P.S.S. discriminant analysis program (16) provided the following output: (a) univariate F ratios for the difference between the American and Vietnamese respondents on each of the 36 values, (b) an estimate of the variance unaccounted for each F ratio [Wilkes Lambda (Λ)], (c) covariate F ratios for each value and (d) a multivariate F ratio for the difference between the groups on a linear combination of values. In the interest of economy of space only the results of the overall comparison will be presented in tabular form and only univariate F ratios will be discussed.[4] For all univariate and covariate F ratios the α level was set at .025. The multivariate F ratios reported are those obtained at the "step" in the discriminant analysis where the covariate F ratios for the values not loading on the discriminant function were less than 2.0.

3. Overall Difference Between American and Vietnamese Value Systems

The comparisons between American and Vietnamese value systems are presented in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The rank order correlation between the relative importance of the two groups' terminal value systems was +.91. Despite this high correlation, significant differences were found between the mean ranking of 13 of the 18 values. The largest univariate F ratios were for the values: National Security (Vietnamese, on the average, considered it more important), Freedom (Vietnamese considered it less important), and

Social Recognition (Vietnamese considered it more important). The linear combination of 14 values significantly discriminated between the Vietnamese and American samples [multivariate F=53.31, df=14/1762, $p < .001$; percent of variance accounted for ($1-\Lambda$): 28.8%.]

The rank order correlation between the two groups' instrumental value systems was +.29. Although statistical tests for differences between the two correlations could not be conducted (cf. 11), the difference in rank order correlations was clearly in the predicted direction (i. e., greater similarity between terminal value systems than between instrumental value systems.) There were significant differences between the two groups on 15 of the 18 instrumental values. The largest univariate F ratios were for Obedient (Vietnamese considered it more important than Americans), Ambitious, and Broadminded (Vietnamese considered them less important). The linear combination of 14 instrumental values significantly discriminated between the two groups [multivariate F=78.77, df=14/1762, $p < .001$; percent of variance accounted for ($1-\Lambda$): 39.5%]

4. Same Sex Comparisons

It was hypothesized that the difference in value systems between women in Vietnam and America would be greater than the differences between men in the two countries.

The rank order correlations between the Vietnamese males (n=180) and American males (n=684) terminal values was +.83. Ten of the 18 individual value rankings were significantly different. The largest univariate F ratios were for National Security, Freedom, and Self Respect

(Vietnamese males considered the last two values less important). The linear combination of 11 values significantly discriminated between the two groups [multivariate F=30.87, df=11/853, p<.001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 28.5%]

For women (Vietnamese, n=169; Americans, n=743), the rank order correlation between terminal values was +.77. There were significant differences in the mean rankings of 13 of the 18 values. The largest univariate F ratios were for the values Freedom, Social Recognition, and Happiness (Vietnamese women considered it more important). The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 12 values was 38.33 [df =12/899, p<.001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 34.0%].

Turning to the instrumental values, the rank order correlation for men was +.32. Eleven of the 18 univariate F ratios were significant. The largest of these were for the values Obedient, Ambitious, and Broadminded. The multivariate F, based on the linear combination of 12 values, was 43.91 [df=12/852, p < .001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 38.2%].

The rank order correlation between Vietnamese and American women's instrumental value systems was +.39. Eleven of the 18 mean rankings for the instrumental values were significantly different. The largest F ratios were for the values Obedient, Responsible, and Ambitious (Vietnamese considered the last two less important). The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 12 variables was 57.74 [df=12/899, p < .001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 43.5%].

5. Differences in Value Systems Among Educational Groups

Respondents in both samples were classified as having completed elementary school, high school, or college, and their values were compared via discriminant analyses. Since the differences between high school educated American and Vietnamese were intermediate between differences for the elementary and college educated, they will be omitted here.

For individuals with an elementary school education (Vietnamese, n=165; Americans, n=308), the rank order correlations between their terminal values was +.83. Twelve of the 18 mean value rankings were significantly different. As before, the largest univariate F ratios were for the values Freedom, National Security, and Social Recognition. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 10 values, was 34.94 [df=10/452, $p < .001$; variance accounted for ($1-\Lambda$): 43.5%].

The rank order correlation between college educated respondents' (Vietnamese, n=43 ; Americans, n=385) terminal value systems was +.73. Eight univariate F ratios were significant. The largest of these were for the values Social Recognition, A Comfortable Life (Vietnamese considered it more important than Americans), and National Security. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 9 values was 12.48 [df=9/418, $p < .001$; variance accounted for ($1-\Lambda$): 21.1%].

With regard to the instrumental values, for the elementary education groups the rank order correlation was +.42. Of the 11 significant F ratios, the largest were for Obedient, Ambitious, and Broadminded. The multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination

of 10 values was 46.31 [df=10/462, p < .001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 50.1%].

The rank order correlation between the instrumental value systems of college educated Americans and Vietnamese was +.45. Seven univariate F ratios were significant, the largest of these being for the values Obedient, Ambitious, and Broadminded. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 10 values was 12.80 [df=10/417, p < .001; variance accounted for (1-Λ): 23.5%].

D. DISCUSSION

Not surprisingly, the discriminant analyses disclosed a large number of differences between the value systems of the Vietnamese and American samples. In the interest of economy of space, only those differences that were predicted in the introduction to this paper and/or were especially dramatic (in terms of the size of the F ratios and variance accounted for) will be discussed.

1. Overall Differences in Value Systems

In accord with the prediction made regarding the relative similarity of terminal and instrumental value systems in the two countries, the difference between instrumental value systems was much greater than the differences between terminal value systems. This was true in terms of (a) the relative size of the rank order correlations, (b) the number of significant univariate F ratios, and (c) the variance accounted for by the linear combinations of values. Thus, although Vietnamese and Americans differed in terms of their goals in life, this difference was not as great as the difference in

their beliefs about how to reach these goals.

Although the two groups did not differ significantly in their ranking of A World At Peace, the Vietnamese did rank National Security significantly higher than did Americans. Clearly, this value was the best discriminator between the two groups' terminal values. This was true both in terms of the variance accounted for by the univariate F ratio ($1-\Lambda$: 8.7%) and the covariate F ratio for this value. The fact that Vietnamese considered National Security much more important than did Americans probably reflected the average Vietnamese's concern about security. The defining phrase that accompanies National Security on the value survey is "protection from attack." The civil war that continued in Vietnam for 30 years seems to be the logical cause for this greater concern with security among the Vietnamese. Indirect support for this conclusion is provided by Rim's (18) study of the values of Israeli college students. Israelis find themselves in a situation similar to that confronted by the Vietnamese at the time these data were collected. That is, the threat of terrorist activity and/or outright war is constant in Israel. Relative to Canadian, American, and Australian students, Israelis sampled in Rim's study considered National Security as much more important.

It is the authors' opinion that for most Vietnamese the high ranking given National Security did not reflect a sense of allegiance to the government in power or a sense of nationhood as it seems to for Americans (21). White (23) and Halberstam (9) both reported little of these concerns among the average Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese sample's ranking of Freedom was not only lower than the American sample, but also much lower than any other group of nationals on which there are value data (e.g., Australians, Canadians, Israelis). This relative lack of concern for Freedom was interesting in two respects. First, it suggested that Vietnamese were not overly concerned with the value that the American government gave as one of its major reasons for its military involvement in Vietnam--Freedom. The freedom American troops were sent to protect (sic) did not seem to be very important to the average Vietnamese. Second, Rokeach (21) has porposed that one can differentiate people's receptivity to various political ideologies on the basis of the importance assigned the values Freedom and Equality. For example, he has shown that people who rank Freedom high (ranks 1-6) and Equality low (ranks 12-18) are receptive to a capitalistic ideology, whereas people with the reverse pattern are receptive to a communist ideology. If the data from American college students can be generalized to Vietnamese, the relative importance placed on Freedom and Equality by the Vietnamese suggests that they would have been more receptive to a "left-wing" political ideology than would the American sample. This is not to propose that, in fact, the Vietnamese sampled had a well defined political "point of view." White (23) reported that in terms of specific ideology, most Vietnamese were neutral. Rather, the point is that if the average Vietnamese were offered a choice, he (or she) would probably have opted for a left wing ideology, certainly more so than the average American.

Finally, the fact that Vietnamese considered Social Recognition as more important than Americans must be considered. The most parsimonious

explanation of this somewhat unexpected finding is the emphasis that a Confucian ideology places on the defining terms that accompany this value, "respect, admiration." For a Vietnamese, the respect and admiration of his or her peers is of utmost importance. This greater concern with Social Recognition among Vietnamese than Americans was evident in all the subsequent comparisons.

The best discriminator among the instrumental values was the value Obedient. Vietnamese ranked it second, Americans sixteenth. The difference in the ranking of Obedient contributed over half to the total variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratio. It should be noted that this difference in the importance assigned Obedient was evident in all subsequent comparisons that were made, and that Vietnamese considered Obedient as more important than any demographically defined subgroup in America.

The other strong discriminator between the two cultures was the value Ambitious. It was ranked lower by the Vietnamese than by Americans. When the correlation with the rankings of other values was "partialed out," Ambitious emerged as the best discriminator between the two samples. The lack of concern with Ambitious probably reflected (a) the Confucian ideology and (b) the realities of the social system in Vietnam. To expand on the second point, in Vietnam the probability of a "Horatio Alger" success story was small. A Vietnamese's ultimate status in society was, at the time this study was conducted, determined primarily by the family he was born into. Although there are both de jure and de facto barriers to upward social mobility in America, these are not as strong as they were in Vietnam. Thus, in a society

where ambition yielded few changes in a person's life it is not surprising that it was not considered important.

2. Same Sex Comparisons

The value systems of males in the two countries tended to be more similar than the value systems of women. Although there was no significant difference in the rank order correlations, the number of significant univariate F ratios and the variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratio were both greater in the female comparison.

In accord with the hypothesis regarding differences in specific values, Vietnamese women considered Equality significantly less important than American women, but Vietnamese men did not differ from American men. This difference was most reasonably due to (a) the role assigned to women in Confucian society and (b) the increasing concern among American women with their equal rights over the past few years (22). Thus it would seem that Vietnamese women had internalized the subservient role assigned to them in the Vietnamese culture.

Additional support of this proposal is provided by an examination of the importance assigned to the instrumental value Obedient by the respondents. Although both male and female Vietnamese considered Obedient more important than Americans, Vietnamese women considered Obedient significantly more important than Vietnamese men ($F=20.36$, $df=1/347$, $p < .001$). In contrast, American women considered it nonsignificantly less important than American men. This resulted in Obedient's mean ranking being an enormously powerful discriminator between women in the two cultures.

In accord with the hypothesis, Vietnamese women considered Ambitious much less important than American women. But it must be added that Vietnamese men also ranked Ambitious as less important than their American counterparts. Within the Vietnamese sample there was no significant difference between males and females in the rank assigned Ambitious. Whereas the rank assigned Responsible ("reliable, dependable") was not a very powerful discriminator between males, it was for females. Within the Vietnamese sample, women considered Responsible significantly less important than did males ($F=19.35$, $df=1/347$, $p < .01$). This difference seemed to be due to the family-oriented role assigned Vietnamese women. In the American sample, there was no significant difference between men and women in the importance assigned Responsible.

3. Educational Comparisons

There were no significant differences in the rank order correlations computed for the terminal values. However, when the number of significant univariate F ratios and the amount of variance accounted for by the multivariate F ratios were considered, it appeared that college-educated individuals in the two countries possessed much more similar value systems than did individuals in the two countries with less education.

Perhaps the most interesting divergence between the college education comparison and the elementary education comparison was in the importance assigned the values Equality and Freedom. There was no significant difference in the importance assigned these two values between college-educated individuals in the two countries. But Vietnamese with an elementary school education considered these values significantly less important than did their American counterparts. Further, college-educated Vietnamese

considered these two values significantly more important than their less educated fellow Vietnamese.

As noted previously, Rokeach (21) has posited that the importance assigned Equality and Freedom is related to a person's receptivity to a political ideology. If the proposal is valid, then two observations seem appropriate. First, college-educated Vietnamese were receptive to an American political ideology and to a certain degree had internalized the values Americans were supposedly "fighting for" in Vietnam. Second, the fact that college-educated Vietnamese considered Equality and Freedom significantly more important than other Vietnamese would suggest that in terms of ideology they may have been more similar to their American counterparts than they were to other, less educated Vietnamese.

College-educated Vietnamese were more similar to their American counterparts in terms of their instrumental values than were less educated Vietnamese. However, the instrumental value systems of college-educated persons in the two countries were much less similar than were the terminal values of college-educated persons in both countries. It should also be noted that in all educational comparisons, the same three instrumental values--Ambitious, Broadminded, and Obedient--received significantly different mean ranks from American and Vietnamese respondents. It would thus seem that while education had a strong influence on terminal values, it had a much less powerful impact on the instrumental values basic to Vietnamese culture.

It was possible that this greater similarity between the value systems of college-educated individuals than between less educated persons in the two countries was simply a function of the effect of higher education in the two countries. In order to determine the tenability of this alternative

explanation, subsequent analyses were conducted in which each of the Vietnamese educational sbugroups was compared to the entire American sample. College-educated Vietnamese differed significantly from the entire American sample on only five of the 18 terminal values. The multivariate F ratio based on the linear combination of 9 values only accounted for 5.4% of the variance. By contrast, Vietnamese with an elementary school education had significantly different mean rankings from the entire American sample on 14 of the 18 values and the multivariate F ratio, based on the linear combination of 11 values, accounted for 25.4% of the variance. Essentially the same pattern of results was obtained when instrumental values were compared. Thus, college-educated Vietnamese were not simply more like their American counterparts than were elementary-school-educated Vietnamese, but rather college-educated Vietnamese were more like Americans in general than the other Vietnamese educational groups.

On the basis of the results obtained in this study, the following conclusions seem warranted. First, what primarily differentiated the respondents in the two countries was not their goals in life (i.e., terminal values), but rather the means by which these goals are reached (i.e., instrumental values). These instrumental value differences seemed to be primarily due to the presence of a Confucian influence in Vietnam and may be less modifiable by experiential factors (e.g., education) than terminal values. This second conclusion is based on the finding that, although college-educated Vietnamese had become "American-like" in their terminal values, their instrumental values tended to remain Vietnamese (e.g., the importance assigned Ambitious, Broadminded, and Obedient).

With regard to the impact of the American presence in Vietnam on

the values of the Vietnamese, it seemed to affect primarily the terminal values of a small (15% of the present sample) elite group of Vietnamese. This perhaps underscores the futility and tragedy of the American involvement in Vietnam.

References

1. Allport, G. W., Vernon, P. E., & Lindzey, A. A Study of Values. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1960.
2. An Annotated Atlas of Viet-nam. Washington, D.C.: Embassy of South Vietnam, 1972.
3. Cochrane, R. & Rokeach, M. Rokeach's value survey: A methodological note. J. Exper. Res. Personal., 1970, 4, 159-161.
4. Conroy, W. J., Katkin, E. S., & Barnette, W. L. Modification of smoking behavior by Rokeach's self-confrontation technique. Paper presented at meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, April, 1973.
5. Devos, G. A. & Hippler, A. A. Cultural psychology: Comparative studies of human behavior. In G. Lindzey & Aronson, (Eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 4.) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
6. Feather, N. T. Test-retest reliability of individual values and value systems. Austral. J. Psychol., 1971, 23, 201-211.
7. Feather, N. T. & Hutton, M. A. Value systems of students in Papua, New Guinea, and Australia. Internat. J. Psychol., 1974, 9, 91-104.
8. Gettleman, M. E. Vietnam: History, Documents and Opinions on a Major World Crisis. New York: Fawcett, 1966.
9. Halberstam, D. The Best and the Brightest. New York: Fawcett, 1972.
10. Hammer, E. J. Vietnam Yesterday and Today. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.

11. Hays, W. L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

12. Hopkins, S. W. Behavioral and attitude change produced from dissonance between interpersonal values and attitudes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1973.

13. Kerlinger, F. N. & Pedhazur, E. J. Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

14. Kluckhohn, C. Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.) Toward A General Theory of Action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

15. Morris, C. W. Variety of Human Value. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

16. Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, J. H. Statistical package for the social sciences. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

17. Penner, L. A. Interpersonal attraction toward a black person as a function of value importance. Personality, 1971, 26, 453-459.

18. Rim, Y. Values and attitudes. Personality, 1970, 1, 243-250.

19. Rokeach, M. Value survey. Sunnyvale, California: Halgren Tests, 1967.

20. Rokeach, M. Long-range experimental modification of values, attitudes and behavior. Amer. Psychol., 1971, 26, 283-292.

21. Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York: Free Press, 1973.

22. Rokeach, M.. Change and stability in American value systems, 1968-1971. Public Opin. Quart., 1974, 38, 222-238.

23. White, R. K. Nobody Wanted War. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Footnotes

[1]This study is based on a doctoral dissertation submitted by the second author in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree at the University of South Florida. Requests for reprints should be sent to the first author, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

[2]Because relatives of the second author and individuals who aided in the collection of the data still reside in South Vietnam, he has requested that a pseudonym be used.

[3]The collection of these data was supported by a National Science Foundation grant to Dr. Rokeach. The authors are grateful to him for providing the American sample's value data.

[4]Complete copies of the discriminant analysis and the characteristics of the Vietnamese respondents are available from the first author.

Table 1

Comparison of American and Vietnamese Value Systems

Terminal Values[a]	Americans (n=1428) X̄	Rank	Vietnamese (n=349) X̄	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/1775)	F_{cov}[b] (df=1/1762)	1-Λ[c]
A Comfortable Life	9.95	5	7.19	5	82.92*	41.14*	4.5%
An Exciting Life	13.94	18	13.33	17	6.16*	26.59*	0.4%
A Sense of Accomplishment	9.44	11	10.65	12	21.94*	<2	1.3%
A World at Peace	4.56	1	4.99	1	2.91	<2	-
A World of Beauty	11.83	15	13.50	18	41.33*	<2	2.3%
Equality	8.45	7	9.66	8	17.54*	16.37*	1.0%
Family Security	5.23	2	5.30	2	<2	<2	-
Freedom	6.25	3	9.09	7	130.24*	38.04*	6.9%
Happiness	7.95	4	5.69	4	83.14*	132.27*	4.5%
Inner Harmony	10.07	13	11.20	13	18.52*	9.82*	1.1%
Mature Love	11.44	14	11.97	15	3.72	18.41*	-
National Security	9.15	9	5.47	3	168.75*	253.75*	8.7%
Pleasure	13.69	16	12.73	16	16.34*	9.69*	1.0%
Salvation	9.16	10	10.90	11	11.36*	2.93	0.7%
Self Respect	7.97	6	9.99	9	66.89*	6.56*	3.7%
Social Recognition	13.82	17	11.32	14	112.02*	108.30*	6.0%
True Friendship	9.52	12	10.00	10	3.77	4.41	-
Wisdom	8.51	8	8.45	6	<2	54.21*	-
Instrumental Values							
Ambitious	7.70	3	12.10	17	196.23*	201.14*	10.0%
Broadminded	7.97	5	10.95	15	99.99*	39.60*	5.4%
Capable	9.48	9	8.65	7	9.44*	11.32*	0.6%
Cheerful	10.12	13	10.51	13	<2	2.17	-
Clean	9.55	11	8.63	6	8.89*	6.23*	0.5%
Courageous	8.53	6	8.20	5	<2	<2	-
Forgiving	7.77	4	7.27	3	3.27	<2	-
Helpful	8.83	7	9.87	10	14.84*	21.30*	0.9%
Honest	4.47	1	5.56	1	22.12*	27.59*	1.3%
Imaginative	13.85	18	12.83	18	15.42*	3.27	0.9%
Independent	9.92	12	8.03	4	40.75*	8.10*	2.3%
Intellectual	11.67	15	10.42	12	18.11*	2.24	1.1%
Logical	12.41	17	11.66	16	7.87*	<2	0.5%
Loving	8.93	8	10.03	11	13.13*	48.24*	0.8%
Obedient	12.33	16	6.21	2	454.18*	188.98*	21.4%
Polite	10.78	14	9.54	9	21.23*	<2	1.2%
Responsible	7.07	2	9.53	8	86.95*	68.59*	4.7%
Self-Controlled	9.54	10	10.94	14	21.97*	16.12*	1.3%

* $p < .025$

[a]The lower the mean value, the more important the value.
[b]This is the covariate F ratio at the "step" where those values that had not entered the discriminant function had an F value of less than 2.00
[c]This is the percentage of variance accounted for by the univariate F (i.e., $1-\Lambda \times 100$ = percent variance accounted for).

Tab

Comparison of Male and Female

Males

Values[1]	American (n=685) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=180) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/863)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/853)	1-Λ[3]
A Comfortable Life	9.23	9	7.33	5	20.10*	3.80	2.3%
An Exciting Life	13.34	17	13.04	16	< 2	7.90*	-
A Sense of Accomplishment	9.11	8	10.07	9	6.59*	< 2	0.8%
A World at Peace	4.83	1	4.97	2	< 2	< 2	-
A World of Beauty	12.06	15	13.90	18	25.52*	6.02*	2.9%
Equality	8.69	6	8.85	8	< 2	7.63*	-
Family Security	5.16	2	5.82	3	3.72	8.42*	0.5%
Freedom	5.94	3	8.12	6	41.09 *	32.72*	4.5%
Happiness	7.89	4	6.04	4	27.66*	57.40*	3.2%
Inner Harmony	10.69	13	11.31	13	3.00	< 2	0.4%
Mature Love	11.09	14	12.31	15	10.52*	< 2	1.2%
National Security	9.24	10	4.91	1	117.42*	135.09*	12.0%
Pleasure	13.26	16	13.05	17	< 2	< 2	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.14	12	10.18	11	< 2	< 2	-
Self Respect	8.19	5	10.13	10	29.95*	11.16*	3.4%
Social Recognition	13.55	18	11.72	14	28.54*	15.91*	3.2%
True Friendship	9.44	11	10.37	12	7.58*	< 2	0.9%
Wisdon	9.07	7	8.80	7	< 2	11.65*	-

* $p < .025$

erican and Vietnamese Terminal Value Systems

Females

Values[1]	American (n=743) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=169) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/910)	F^{2}_{cov} (df=1/899)	1-Λ[3]
A Comfortable Life	10.61	13	7.05	5	69.77*	29.29*	7.2%
An Exciting Life	14.48	8	13.65	18	6.77*	10.43*	0.8%
A Sense of Accomplishment	9.75	12	11.26	14	18.57*	< 2	2.0%
A World at Peace	4.30	1	5.01	2	4.16	< 2	0.5%
A World of Beauty	11.63	14	13.07	17	15.43*	< 2	1.7%
Equality	8.22	7	10.52	10	31.78*	< 2	3.4%
Family Security	5.29	2	4.74	1	3.06	< 2	1.4%
Freedom	6.53	3	10.13	9	99.98*	21.41*	9.9%
Happiness	8.00	6	5.32	3	59.11*	57.10*	6.1%
Inner Harmony	9.50	10	11.08	13	17.58*	5.20*	1.9%
Mature Love	11.76	15	11.62	15	< 2	16.00*	-
National Security	9.06	9	6.08	4	55.78*	114.68*	5.8%
Pleasure	14.09	17	12.39	16	27.92*	9.48*	3.0%
Salvation (Nirvana)	8.24	8	10.62	11	21.12*	< 2	2.3%
Self Respect	7.78	4	9.84	8	36.32*	4.51	3.9%
Social Recognition	14.06	16	10.89	12	95.75*	85.31*	9.6%
True Friendship	9.60	11	9.59	7	< 2	4.99	-
Wisdom	7.99	5	8.07	6	< 2	28.39*	-

Table

Comparison of Male and Female, American

Males

Values[1]	American (n=685) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=180) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/863)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/852)	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitious	6.87	2	11.93	16	132.27*	142.62*	13.3%
Broadminded	7.85	4	11.33	15	72.46*	36.06*	7.8%
Capable	8.85	7	7.32	3	16.82*	13.14*	2.0%
Cheerful	10.65	13	11.38	14	3.37	$\angle 2$	0.4%
Clean	9.92	11	9.27	8	2.29	3.00	0.3%
Courageous	8.50	5	7.87	5	2.40	$\angle 2$	0.3%
Forgiving	8.84	6	8.42	7	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Helpful	9.38	9	10.53	12	9.11*	8.99*	1.1%
Honest	4.59	1	5.76	1	11.76*	8.06*	1.4%
Imaginative	13.12	18	12.31	18	4.32	$\angle 2$	0.5%
Independent	9.68	10	6.96	2	44.18*	11.59*	4.9%
Intellectual	11.47	15	9.58	10	20.84*	6.20*	3.4%
Logical	11.83	16	11.22	13	2.39	3.62	0.3%
Loving	10.02	12	12.20	17	29.43*	40.72*	3.3%
Obedient	12.28	17	7.46	4	133.71*	49.94*	13.5%
Polite	10.83	14	9.61	11	10.24*	$\angle 2$	1.2%
Responsible	6.99	3	8.22	6	10.64*	28.95*	1.3%
Self Controlled	9.24	8	9.54	9	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-

* $p < .025$

nd Vietnamese Instrumental Value Systems

Females

Values:[1]	American (n=743) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=169) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/910)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/899)	1-Λ[3]
Ambitious	8.46	7	12.63	17	78.35*	31.21*	8.0%
Broadminded	8.09	5	10.55	12	32.20*	∠2	3.5%
Capable	10.06	12	10.05	11	∠2	11.96*	-
Cheerful	9.84	10	9.58	10	∠2	∠2	-
Clean	9.21	9	7.94	5	8.15*	∠2	1.0%
Courageous	8.57	8	8.56	6	∠2	3.60	-
Forgiving	6.79	2	6.05	3	4.15	∠2	0.5%
Helpful	8.33	6	9.17	8	5.00	∠2	0.6%
Honest	4.37	1	5.35	2	9.96*	5.79*	1.1%
Imaginative	14.51	18	13.39	18	11.62*	24.19*	1.3%
Independent	10.14	13	9.16	7	5.27*	16.81*	0.6%
Intellectual	11.85	15	11.31	14	∠2	7.79*	-
Logical	12.95	17	12.13	15	5.23*	19.51*	0.6%
Loving	7.91	4	7.72	4	∠2	∠2	-
Obedient	12.36	16	4.87	1	368.92*	334.34*	28.9%
Polite	10.72	14	9.46	9	11.11*	10.69*	1.3%
Responsible	7.14	3	10.92	13	108.86*	28.55*	10.7%
Self Controlled	9.81	11	12.43	16	40.13 *	6.93*	4.3%

Tab

Comparison of American and Vietname

Elementary School

Values[1]	American (n=308) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=165) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/471)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/462)	$1-\Lambda$[3]
A Comfortable Life	7.98	5	6.89	5	5.39*	<2	1.2%
An Exciting Life	13.85	18	13.70	17	<2	<2	-
A Sense of Accomplishment	10.74	12	11.05	13	<2	<2	-
A World at Peace	4.14	1	4.50	2	<2	<2	-
A World of Beauty	12.05	14	13.79	18	17.26*	3.24	3.6%
Equality	8.96	10	10.15	9	6.42*	<2	1.4%
Family Security	5.32	2	4.39	1	6.37*	<2	1.4%
Freedom	6.31	3	10.16	10	92.64*	49.51*	16.5%
Happiness	7.56	4	5.40	4	29.31*	55.30*	5.9%
Inner Harmony	11.77	13	11.15	14	2.31	5.13*	0.5%
Mature Love	12.61	15	12.64	15	<2	<2	-
National Security	8.67	9	4.95	3	90.46*	81.11*	16.2%
Pleasure	12.88	16	12.83	16	<2	4.30	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	8.33	6	9.66	7	5.34*	<2	1.2%
Self Respect	8.48	7	9.79	8	10.46*	8.33*	2.2%
Social Recognition	13.13	17	10.93	12	31.06*	11.54*	7.2%
True Friendship	8.50	8	10.30	11	21.07*	11.08*	4.3%
Wisdom	9.64	11	8.65	6	5.08*	7.39*	1.1%

* $p < .025$

ducational Group's Terminal Value System

College

Values[1]	American (n=385) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=43) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/426)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/418)	1-Λ[3]
A Comfortable Life	11.83	15	8.58	8	18.96*	13.92*	4.3%
An Exciting Life	13.18	16	12.83	16	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
A Sense of Accomplishment	7.89	6	9.74	10	7.28*	$\angle 2$	1.7%
A World at Peace	5.17	1	6.18	1	$\angle 2$	4.73	-
A World of Beauty	11.46	14	13.09	18	5.49*	$\angle 2$	1.3%
Equality	8.06	7	8.53	7	$\angle 2$	3.97	-
Family Security	5.99	2	7.53	5	5.19*	10.17*	1.2%
Freedom	6.43	3	6.69	2	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Happiness	8.42	8	7.25	4	3.12	4.20	0.8%
Inner Harmony	8.55	9	10.34	13	6.12*	$\angle 2$	1.5%
Mature Love	10.27	11	10.30	12	$\angle 2$	3.40	-
National Security	10.34	12	7.06	3	15.68*	32.13*	3.6%
Pleasure	13.99	17	13.23	17	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Salvation (Nirvana)	10.66	13	11.02	14	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Self Respect	7.36	4	9.97	11	15.45*	11.09*	3.5%
Social Recognition	14.45	18	11.27	15	29.43*	32.89*	6.5%
True Friendship	9.35	10	9.23	9	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Wisdom	7.47	5	8.06	6	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-

Tab

Comparison of American and Vietnamese

Elementary School

Values[1]	American (n=308) $\bar{X}$	Rank	Vietnamese (n=165) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/471)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/462)	$1-\Lambda$[3]
Ambitious	7.44	3	12.60	17	84.70*	38.09*	16.3%
Broadminded	8.35	8	11.33	4	43.31*	6.54*	9.5%
Capable	9.81	12	8.15	6	12.82*	21.85*	2.7%
Cheerful	9.06	9	10.29	12	7.23*	$\angle 2$	1.6%
Clean	7.71	4	7.68	4	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Courageous	8.08	6	8.10	5	$\angle 2$	5.71*	-
Forgiving	6.47	2	6.97	3	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Helpful	8.02	5	9.07	8	5.93*	$\angle 2$	1.3%
Honest	4.69	1	4.73	2	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Imaginative	14.63	18	13.51	18	9.38*	5.91*	2.0%
Independent	9.67	11	8.32	7	8.33*	6.60*	1.8%
Intellectual	13.22	16	11.78	15	11.77*	5.74*	2.5%
Logical	14.26	17	12.35	16	31.80*	22.21*	7.4%
Loving	9.22	10	9.82	9	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Obedient	10.94	14	4.26	1	212.32*	126.44*	31.2%
Polite	10.20	13	10.27	10	$\angle 2$	$\angle 2$	-
Responsible	8.15	7	10.28	11	25.56*	19.52*	5.2%
Self-Controlled	10.98	15	11.76	13	2.89	$\angle 2$	0.7%

* $p < .025$

ducational Group's Instrumental Value Systems

Values[1]	College: American (n=385) $\bar{X}$	Rank	College: Vietnamese (n=43) $\bar{X}$	Rank	F_{univ} (df=1/426)	F_{cov}[2] (df=1/417)	1-β
Ambitious	8.38	3	12.06	18	18.77*	6.35*	5.3%
Broadminded	7.02	8	9.48	10	10.75*	2	2.5%
Capable	9.04	9	9.39	9	∠2	∠2	-
Cheerful	10.97	14	9.30	8	4.85	11.08*	1.0%
Clean	12.08	17	11.55	16	∠2	∠2	-
Courageous	8.83	5	8.58	6	∠2	∠2	-
Forgiving	8.87	6	7.46	2	3.34	11.11*	0.8%
Helpful	9.50	11	10.48	14	∠2	∠2	-
Honest	4.42	1	6.41	1	10.64*	5.04*	2.5%
Imaginative	12.07	16	11.30	15	∠2	6.97*	-
Independent	9.27	10	7.90	4	2.82	8.23*	0.7%
Intellectual	9.80	12	7.76	3	6.48*	26.30*	1.5%
Logical	10.40	13	11.74	17	3.09	∠2	0.8%
Loving	8.94	7	10.20	13	2.33	3.80	0.6%
Obedient	14.20	18	10.18	12	32.98*	43.28*	7.2%
Polite	11.95	15	9.81	11	9.52*	12.34*	2.2%
Responsible	6.95	2	8.13	5	5.81*	∠2	1.4%
Self-Controlled	8.71	4	9.16	7	∠2	∠2	-